

PATENT

BBUCP101USA

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION  
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

Date: 2009-02-06

/Eric Jorgenson, Reg.# 46,002/  
Eric D. Jorgenson

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re patent application of:

Appellant: Brett J. Buchanan

Serial No: 10/752,898

Filing Date: January 6, 2004

Examiner: Steven N. Leff

Art Unit: 1761

Title: EDIBLE PET TOY

**Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents**  
**Commissioner for Patents**  
**P.O. Box 1450**  
**Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

---

**AMENDED APPEAL BRIEF IN RESPONSE TO NOTIFICATION OF NON-COMPLIANT  
APPEAL BRIEF DATED JANUARY 12, 2009**

---

Dear Sir:

Appellant submits this amended brief in response to the above Notification to bring the Brief into compliance as requested in the Notification.

**I. Real Party in Interest (37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(i))**

The real party in interest in the present appeal is Brett J. Buchanan, appellant of the present application.

**II. Related Appeals and Interferences (37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(ii))**

Appellant and appellant's legal representatives are not aware of any appeals or interferences which will directly affect, or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**III. Status of Claims (37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(iii))**

Claims 1-2, 5-10, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21-23, and 25-27 are pending in the application. Claims 3, 4, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 20, and 24 have been cancelled. The rejection of claims 1-2, 5-10, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21-23, and 25-27 is appealed.

**IV. Status of Amendments (37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(iv))**

No claim amendments have been made after the final rejection dated August 6, 2008.

**V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter (37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(v))**

The subject embodiments relate to an edible toy and method of making the same. The edible toy provides entertainment and nourishment and/or enjoyment to an animal, such as a cat.

The edible toy includes a shell 102 that provides oral interaction with the animal (as in independent claim 1). The shell 102 can include an edible material and catnip for stimulation of the cat to interact therewith (as in independent claim 10) for maintaining freshness of underlying material and that gradually wears away as the cat interacts therewith (as in independent claim 19). (See, e.g., FIG. 1 and FIG. 2; page 4, lines 6-11.)

One or more underlying layers 104, 106, 108, 202, 204 formed of an edible material encased by the shell and the toy is edible in its entirety (as in independent claim 1, 10, and 19). The underlying layer(s) can include a layer binding material that provides consistency to retain

form and the edible material includes catnip (as in independent claims 1, 10, and 19). The binding material releases layer materials upon penetration (as in independent claims 1 and 19). (See, e.g., FIG. 1 and FIG. 2; page 4, lines 23–page 6, line 3.)

In the subject embodiments, the edible material is accessed by biting or clawing of the shell by the cat, to expose the underlying layer(s) underneath. The edible material can include an inducement, a nutrient, or a treatment, and can be in the form of a liquid, a gel, a paste, or one or more edible objects. (See, e.g., page 4, line 28 through page 5, line 6.) Multiple underlying layers can provide a plurality of different edible materials, and these multiple layers can be formed concentrically about a core material.

In various aspects, the shell can include an edible nodule or a string affixed thereto. (See, e.g., page 6, lines 6–17; page 7, lines 7–18.) The shell can also include one or more holes for releasing the inner edible material therethrough to the cat. The shell can be flexible such that distortion thereof by the cat causes the inner edible material to be released to the cat. Further, the shell can be compressed to a compression parameter for a particular type of animal such that a lower compression parameter facilitates easier access to the edible material and a higher compression parameter facilitates more difficult access to the edible material. (See, e.g., page 8, lines 14–24.)

An additional aspect relates to a method of providing an edible toy for an animal, and includes providing an edible material and providing a binding material that provides consistency to retain form. Mixing the edible material and binding material is performed to fashion a homogeneous mixture of an inducement and at least one of a nutrient or a treatment. An outer shell is formed for housing the homogenous mixture, and the edible material is encased within the outer shell. (See, e.g., page 10, lines 3–26.) The mixing of the edible material can be performed such that a mixture of edible components exhibits a marbling effect.

In view of the aforementioned aspects, the subject embodiments provide an edible toy that provides a cat with nutrition in addition to enjoyment. Such a device is not evident from the prior art, particularly that relied upon during prosecution.

#### **VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal (37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(vi))**

- A. Whether claim 5 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.
- B. Whether claims 1-2, 5-10, 13, 19, 21-23, 25, and 27 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Fisher (U.S. 4,260,635) in view of Smith (U.S. 1,022,113).
- C. Whether claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 13, 15, 16, 21-23, 26, and 27 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Baikie (U.S. 6,238,715) in view of Smith (U.S. 1,022,113).
- D. Whether the previously-submitted Declaration Under 37 CFR 1.132 is relevant to the issue of nonobviousness.

#### **VII. Argument (37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(vii))**

- A. Rejection of Claim 5 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This issue was raised in the Final Rejection, not in previous prosecution, and is editorial in nature. The language at issue will be corrected upon favorable reconsideration of the rejections under prior art.

- B. Rejection of Claims 1-2, 5-10, 13, 19, 21-23, 25, and 27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-2, 5-10, 13, 19, 21-23, 25, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher in view of Smith. Reversal of the rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

- i. **Fisher and Smith, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 10, 19, and 21 and claims 2, 5-9, 13, 22-23, 25, and 27, which depend therefrom respectively; therefore, Fisher and Smith do not render unpatentable the present claims to one ordinarily skilled in the art.**
- ii. **The combination of Fisher and Smith is unmotivated and fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, as required by 35 U.S.C. §**

## 103.

The Examiner relies on the structure of Fisher and Smith to reject the subject claims. However, the structure described in Fisher and Smith does not disclose or suggest the structure claimed in the present invention. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, 35 U.S.C. §103 requires that the prior art reference (or references when combined) *must teach or suggest all the claim limitations*. See MPEP §706.02(j). The *teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination* and the reasonable expectation of success *must be found in the prior art and not based on the Applicant's disclosure*. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (emphasis added).

Fisher discloses a pet feeding system for providing food to a dog while providing sufficient exercise for the dog's teeth, gums and jaws, and also having unit-integrity and product "chew life." (See, e.g., col. 4, lines 1-11.) Fisher's pet feeding system includes an outer layer of a high chew-resistance and an inner layer of lesser or no chew-resistance. A number of alternating hard and soft layers *ad infinitum* can be included to meet the chewing demands of a dog. (See, e.g., col. 4, lines 40-50.) The layers are formed from food materials mixed together with safely digestible structure-supporting fibers from animal tissue such as skin, muscles, intestines, etc., from animals, for example from tendons, and animal hides such as cowhide, rawhide, etc. (See, e.g., col. 4, lines 56-60.)

In the aforementioned manner way, Fisher provides an article with food value and chew-resistance to meet the needs of a dog. However, it is evident that the entire disclosure of Fisher relates to the requirements of a *dog* and not those of a *cat*, as is the subject of the presently claimed embodiments. Independent claims 1, 10 and 19 all recite that one or both of the outer shell and edible material include *catnip*, and that claim 21 similarly recites an *inducement*. The Final Action admits that Fisher fails to disclose a toy for a cat and an edible material including catnip. For this purpose, a combination with Smith is proposed who discloses a type of catnip toy. However, this proposed combination is entirely unmotivated. Since the entire disclosure of Fisher relates to a feeding system for a dog that meets the particular chewing needs of a dog, it is readily apparent that such a product cannot be adapted for use with a cat, since it is well known that cats do not have the same teeth and jaw strength capabilities or chewing needs as a dog.

There is no reason why one skilled in the art would seek to combine Fisher's dog feeding and chewing exercise system with Smith's catnip, since such a combination would result in an article that would not be chewable by a cat or a desirable by a dog and thus inoperable for all intents and purposes. Further, it is clear that a considerable amount of engineering and redesigning would be required to adapt Fisher's dog feeding system into an article suitable for chewing and consumption by cats, and that such efforts would go well beyond the disclosure of that reference. Thus, there can be no reasonable expectation of success in accordance with MPEP 2143.02.

The Final Action dismisses these difficulties in asserting the incorporation of Smith's catnip into Fisher's dog-related article, stating that:

...providing a specific single edible material which is known in the art would be merely a matter of obvious choice which is dependent upon the specific animal which the toy is made for, where MPEP 2144.07 states that the selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use supports a prima facie obviousness determination. (Final Action, page 4, line 2 up through page 5, line 3.)

This contention is not well taken. Since the entire disclosure of Fisher relates to a food article for a dog, it is readily apparent that any "obvious choice" related to selecting a specific single edible material must be restricted to dogs, since surely there can be no motivation to incorporate catnip into a dog food item! Thus, there is surely no support for a prima facie obviousness determination under MPEP 2144.07 as contended in the Final Action.

It is readily apparent from the aforementioned discussion and from simple common sense that a combination of Fisher and Smith would not occur to one skilled in the art from reviewing these disclosures alone. One skilled in the art would need to be guided by the present disclosure as a 20/20 hindsight road map to the claimed subject matter. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination is unmotivated and thus a prima facie showing of obviousness has not in fact been established against the subject claims, as is clearly required by 35 U.S.C § 103.

Furthermore, even if such a combination could somehow be contemplated, it would still fail to meet all the requirements of the claimed subject matter. Independent claims 1, 10, and 19 each recite an *outer shell* and an *inner edible material* encased by the shell and including a

*binding material*. Particularly, claim 1 recites an *underlying layer* comprising a *layer binding material* that **releases layer materials upon penetration**. Claim 10 recites that the binding material *provides consistency and rigidity, thereby resulting in a time release of the inner edible material accessible by the cat*. Claim 19 recites that the binding material *provides consistency and rigidity, so as to release inner edible material upon penetration*. In this way, it is clear that the claimed *binding material* and *edible material* are different materials such that the penetration of the binding material results in release of the edible material. However, in rejecting these limitations, the Final Action cites col. 4, lines 1-10. It is readily apparent from inspection that this passage does not include any such disclosure, but rather discusses “unit integrity” of the article while providing chewing exercise to the dog. It is however clear from the disclosure of Fisher that the cowhide and food are formed into a chewable mass that is consumed by the dog such that there is no “release of inner edible material upon penetration” as is recited in the subject claims. Thus, for at least this reason, the Fisher reference, taken alone or in combination with Smith, does not in fact disclose **each and every element** of the subject matter contended in the Final Action, as required by 35 U.S.C § 103.

Additionally, claim 19 recites that the shell *maintains freshness of underlying material and that gradually wears away as the cat interacts therewith*. The Final Action contends that “maintaining freshness” is disclosed by Fisher at col. 4, lines 12-25. However, it is noted that this passage in fact lists a number of food components, indicating that “it is, in general, desirable that said food components have a satisfactory shelf-life so that preservation is no problem.” It is readily apparent that there is no discussion in this passage or elsewhere within the four corners of Fisher of a shell that “maintains freshness of underlying material,” as recited in independent claim 19. The Final Action also contends that “gradual wearing away” is disclosed at col. 1, lines 60-62. However, this passage simply states that chew-resistance is varied with the amount of structure-supporting fibers. Thus, for at least these reasons also, the Fisher reference, taken alone or in combination with Smith, does not in fact disclose **each and every element** of the subject matter contended in the Final Action, as required by 35 U.S.C § 103.

In view of the aforementioned discussion, it is respectfully submitted that Fisher and Smith, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every aspect of the claims, and further, that the combination is unmotivated, thus failing to meet the requirements for a prima facie demonstration of obviousness. Accordingly, for least these reasons, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reversed, and that independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 21 be allowed, along with claims 2, 5-9, 13, 22-23, 25, and 27 that depend respectively therefrom.

C. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 13, 15, 16, 21-23, 26, and 27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 13, 15, 16, 21-23, 26, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baikie in view of Smith. Reversal of the rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons:

- i. **Baikie and Smith, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 13, 15, 16, 21-23, 26, and 27, which depend therefrom respectively; therefore, Baikie and Smith do not render unpatentable the present claims to one ordinarily skilled in the art.**
- ii. **The combination of Baikie and Smith is unmotivated and fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, as required by 35 U.S.C. § 103.**

The Examiner relies on the structure of Baikie and Smith to reject the subject claims. However, the structure described in Baikie and Smith does not disclose or suggest the structure claimed in the present invention. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, 35 U.S.C. §103 requires that the prior art reference (or references when combined) *must teach or suggest all the claim limitations*. See MPEP §706.02(j). The *teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination* and the reasonable expectation of success *must be found in the prior art and not based on the Applicant's disclosure*. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (emphasis added).



Baikie discloses a chew toy for dogs including a hollow bone that is cleaned and sterilized and then filled with a filling that includes a meat mixture and a mold inhibitor to prevent the possibility of mold growth on or in the toy. (See, e.g., col. 2, lines 1-64.) It is thus readily apparent that the Baikie reference can only be construed as meeting the needs of a *dog* and not those of a *cat*, as is the subject of the presently claimed embodiments. It is once again noted that independent claims 1, 10 and 19 all recite that one or both of the outer shell and edible material include *catnip*, and that claim 21 similarly recites an *inducement*. The Final Action admits that Baikie is silent with respect to disclosing a toy for a cat and an edible material including catnip. For this purpose, a combination with Smith is once again proposed who discloses a type of catnip toy.

As with the previous rejection, the proposed combination of Baikie and Smith is entirely unmotivated. It is a fact drawn from common experience that dogs chew on bones, not cats, and that cats lack the teeth and jaw strength to chew and penetrate bones as do dogs. Since Baikie's hollow casing is an animal bone, it would defy all logic to suppose that this chew toy would be in any way suitable for a cat. Thus, it would be inexplicable to add catnip according to Smith to the hollow bone of Baikie. Such a combination would result in an article that would not be in any way chewable by a cat or any interest to a dog. Such a combined article would therefore be inoperable for all intents and purposes, and no amount of engineering or redesigning could be contemplated that make a dog bone toy suitable for consumption by cats. Thus, there can be no reasonable expectation of success in accordance with MPEP 2143.02.

The Final Action again dismisses these difficulties in asserting the incorporation of Smith's catnip into Fisher's dog article, again stating that such a combination amounts to merely a matter of obvious choice! The contention is again made that such an obvious choice is dependent upon the specific animal which the toy is made for, again citing MPEP 2144.07 which states that the selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use supports a prima facie obviousness determination. However, since a dog is the only specific animal for which this toy can be made, there is no suitability in selecting catnip for a dog bone chew toy. Therefore, based on the very reasoning supplied in the Final Action, there can be no prima facie obviousness determination.

It is again readily apparent from the aforementioned discussion and from simple common sense that a combination of Baikie and Smith would not occur to one skilled in the art from reviewing these disclosures alone, and that such would never occur to one skilled in the art without a hindsight reading of the subject disclosure. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination is unmotivated and that a prima facie showing of obviousness has not in fact been established against the subject claims, as is clearly required by 35 U.S.C § 103.

It is further submitted that, even if such a combination could somehow be contemplated, it would still fail to meet all the requirements of the claimed subject matter. Independent claims 1, 10, and 19 each recite an *outer shell* and an *inner edible material* encased by the shell and including a *binding material*. In particular, claim 1 recites an *underlying layer* comprising a *layer binding material* that *provides consistency to retain form* and *releases layer materials upon penetration*. Claim 10 recites that the binding material *provides consistency and rigidity, thereby resulting in a time release of the inner edible material accessible by the cat*. Claim 19 recites that the binding material *provides consistency and rigidity, so as to release inner edible material upon penetration*. In this way, it is clear that the claimed *binding material* and *edible material* are different materials such that the penetration of the binding material results in release of the edible material.

However, in rejecting these limitations, the Final Action cites col. 2, lines 27-31. It is readily apparent from inspection that this passage does not include any such disclosure, but rather discusses that the filling increases interest from the dog as the dog attempts to extract the inside of the bone. There is no discussion of how this result is effected from any binding material. As to limitations of the binding material providing consistency to retain form, col. 2, lines 40-53 is cited which simply discloses steps in forming a premix of various ingredients that form a portion of the filling. A passage at col. 3, lines 16-24 is also cited, but this passage simply discloses cooling steps to change the filling from an aqueous to a gelatin consistency. In any event, it is clear from the disclosure of Baikie that the meat filling is a gelatinous mass and that there is no disclosure of a *binding material* that effects the “release of inner edible material upon penetration” as is recited in the subject claims. Thus, for at least these reasons, the Baikie reference, taken alone or in combination with Smith, does not in fact disclose *each and every*

*element* of the subject matter contended in the Final Action, as required by 35 U.S.C § 103.

Additionally, the Final Action variously states that Baikie discloses edible material which is released through one or more holes in the shell, that edible material is encased in a shell, and that edible material can be replaced through a hole in the outer shell, citing a passage from col. 3, lines 6-9 as allegedly disclosing all three of these various aspects. However, this passage actually states:

Bone 20 is then placed adjacent a free end 45 of tube 40, flow valve 42 is adjusted to its open position, and filling 30 is allowed to flow from holding vat 20 into inner region 22 of bone 20.

It is readily apparent that this passage simply discloses a one-time step of adding filling to the hollow bone. There is nothing disclosed or suggested in this passage or elsewhere within the four corners of Baikie about *releasing, encasing, or replacing* edible material, as recited in the subject claims. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the Final Action misconstrues this passage of the reference in all three instances. Thus, for at least this reason also, the Baikie reference, taken alone or in combination with Smith, does not in fact disclose *each and every element* of the subject matter contended in the Final Action, as required by 35 U.S.C § 103.

In view of the aforementioned discussion, it is respectfully submitted that Fisher and Smith, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every aspect of the claims, and further, that the combination is unmotivated, thus failing to meet the requirements for a prima facie demonstration of obviousness. Accordingly, for least these reasons, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reversed, and that independent claims 1, 10, and 21 be allowed, along with claims 2, 5, 13, 15, 16, 22-23, 26, and 27 that depend respectively therefrom.

D. Holding that the Declaration Under 37 CFR 1.132 is not relevant to the issue of nonobviousness.

The Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 submitted in response to the Office Action of January 8, 2008 was held to be not relevant to the issue of nonobviousness. Reversal of this holding is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

- i. **The Declaration presents evidence of commercial success.**
- ii. **The Declaration presents evidence of long-felt need for the claimed subject matter in the marketplace.**

In an initial remark, the Final Action states:

Regarding applicant's declaration and the testimonials provided which speak to the novelty of the applicant's invention, it is noted that the statement (sic) amount to an *affirmation that the affiant has never seen the claimed subject matter before*. This is not relevant to the issue of nonobviousness of the claimed subject matter and provides no objective evidence thereof. See MPEP § 716. (Emphasis added.)

These statements are baseless and puzzling in that "affiant" is the present appellant who, as the inventor, has surely seen the claimed subject matter before! No detailed explanations are provided as to the reasons why the Declaration is insufficient, as required by MPEP 716, and these statements are therefore merely dismissive of the evidence presented in the Declaration.

The Declaration presents evidence of the commercial success. This issue is not in any way addressed in the Final Action. The claims had been amended to closely comport with the for-sale product so as to be commensurate in scope with the claims, to establish that the commercial success is directly derived from the invention claimed, in a marketplace where the consumer is free to choose on the basis of objective principles, and thus establish the nexus between the claimed invention and evidence of commercial success in accordance with MPEP 716.03, 716.03(a), 716.03(b).

To wit, the Declaration states that the product described in the present claims is currently being sold under the trade name "Pawbreakers" (hereinafter "the product"). The product is currently sold in almost every state in the USA and available through the PETCO chain, and is sold abroad through retail locations in Canada, Japan, Taiwan, Malaysia, Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea, and Poland. This represents significant progress and commercial success for appellant's small business that offers a 100% American-made product. Further evidence of continuing commercial success can be inferred from the various testimonials in the Declaration,

as quoted hereinbelow.

The Declaration also presented evidence of the long-felt need for the claimed subject matter in the marketplace. This evidence in the form of testimonials from veterinarians and well known authorities in the field indicates that for a long period of time there has been a need for a cat toy that engages a cat's attention for a sustained period, and that other products in the field have not met the need as satisfactorily as has been done by the claimed subject matter, in accordance with MPEP 716.04.

For example, a testimonial was received from Franny Syufy, an award-winning member of the Cat Writers' Association, who wrote that, *Brett Buchanan has proven again the old adage that "necessity is the mother of invention" with his Pawbreakers concept.* Franny's testimonial indicates that appellant has solved the problem of containing catnip in a manner satisfying to cats. Franny notes that, *Pawbreakers were the result of countless hours of experimenting and testing on enthusiastic cats, until exactly the right shape and size was attained*, thereby observing other overall benefits and desirable properties of the claimed subject matter.

In another testimonial, Dr. Elizabeth Devitt, a writer for *PET AGE* magazine, observes that *Pawbreakers combine domestically grown catnip with a hypoallergenic binder into a long-lasting toy that cats actually can consume*, thereby acknowledging the innovative aspects of and the desirable results obtained from the claimed subject matter. In a further testimonial, Pam Johnson-Bennett, CABC, a well-known and popular expert on cat behavior, indicates that the claimed subject matter *could be a valuable tool for behavior modification* and that she would *like more behaviorists and other professionals to know about it.*

The testimonial evidence indicates that the actual structure of the claimed subject matter provides solutions to long-noted problems in the areas of catnip toy manufacture and cat behavior modification. However, the Final Action is also dismissive of this evidence. Further, the Final Action states that:

[T]here is no evidence that if persons skilled in the art who were presumably working on the problem knew of the teachings of the above cited references, they would still be unable to solve the problem.

With regards to the prior art rejections in the Final Action, it is respectfully submitted that this statement is without basis. The Final Action relies on dog bone articles in combination with catnip, shown hereinabove to be unmotivated and failing to disclose each and every aspect of the claimed subject matter. It is further noted that the Office Action of January 8, 2008 that preceded the Final Action relied upon a similarly unlikely combination of cat toy articles.

For at least these reasons, it is again respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art would not overcome the aforementioned problems in the art from these references or any of the other feeble combinations of references offered throughout the prolonged prosecution of the present application. Accordingly, for least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rebuttal evidence of nonobviousness does in fact outweigh the alleged evidence of obviousness, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

**Conclusion**

For at least the above reasons, the claims currently under consideration are believed to be patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 1-2, 5-10, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21-23, and 25-27 be reversed.

In the event any additional fees may be due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-3663 [BBUCP101USA]

Respectfully submitted,

/Eric Jorgenson, Reg.# 46,002/

Eric D. Jorgenson

Reg. No. 46,002

Law Office of Eric D. Jorgenson, Esq.  
1457 King Road  
Hinckley, Ohio 44233  
Telephone (216) 225-4169  
Facsimile (330) 278-3135

**VIII. Appendix of Claims (37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(viii))**

1. An edible toy for an animal, comprising:  
a shell for oral interaction with the animal; and  
at least one underlying layer formed of an edible material encased by the shell,  
the toy is edible in its entirety;  
wherein the at least one underlying layer comprises a layer binding material that provides consistency to retain form, the binding material releases layer materials upon penetration, and the edible material including catnip.
2. The toy of claim 1, wherein the edible material comprises at least one of an inducement, a nutrient, or a treatment.
5. The toy of claim 1, wherein the edible material is accessed by at least one of the cat biting the shell or clawing the shell.
6. The toy of claim 1, wherein the at least one underlying layer comprises multiple layers of a plurality of different edible materials.
7. The toy of claim 6, wherein the multiple layers are formed concentrically about a core material.
8. The toy of claim 1, wherein the shell includes at least one of an edible nodule or a string affixed thereto.
9. The toy of claim 1, wherein the shell is compressed to a compression parameter for a particular animal such that a lower compression parameter facilitates easier access to the edible material and a higher compression parameter facilitates more difficult access to the edible material.



10. An edible toy for a cat, comprising:  
an outside shell for oral interaction with the cat, the shell comprises an edible material and catnip for stimulation of the cat to interact therewith; and  
an inner edible material encased by the shell, the inner edible material comprises a binding material that provides consistency and rigidity, thereby resulting in a time release of the inner edible material accessible by the cat, the inner edible material made of edible components and catnip, wherein the entire toy is of edible material and thereby edible in its entirety.
13. The toy of claim 12, wherein the inner edible material is in the form of at least one of a liquid, a gel, a paste, or one or more edible objects.
15. The toy of claim 10, wherein the shell includes one or more holes for releasing the inner edible material therethrough to the cat.
16. The toy of claim 10, wherein the shell is flexible such that distortion thereof by the cat causes the inner edible material to be released to the cat.
19. An edible toy for a cat, comprising:  
a shell for interaction by the cat, the shell made of an edible material that includes catnip, maintains freshness of underlying material and that gradually wears away as the cat interacts therewith; and  
an inner edible material that is the underlying material and which is encased by the shell and accessible by the cat over an extended period of time, wherein the shell and inner edible material include an edible binding material that provides consistency and rigidity, so as to release inner edible material upon penetration, such that the toy is composed of edible material in its entirety.

21. A method of providing an edible toy for an animal, comprising:  
providing an edible material;  
providing a binding material that provides consistency to retain form;  
mixing the edible material and binding material into a homogeneous mixture of  
an inducement and at least one of a nutrient or a treatment;  
forming an outer shell for housing the homogenous mixture; and  
encasing the edible material within the outer shell.
22. The method of claim 21, wherein the edible material includes an inducement that stimulates the animal, which is a cat, to interact therewith.
23. The method of claim 22, further comprising compressing the shell and the edible material to a compression parameter that allows the cat to access the edible material via at least one of licking, biting, or clawing.
25. The method of claim 21, further comprising mixing the edible material such that a mixture of edible components thereof exhibit a marbling effect.
26. The method of claim 21, further comprising forming a hole in the outer shell such that the edible material can be replaced therethrough.
27. The method of claim 21, wherein the outer shell comprises the edible material.

**IX. Appendix of Evidence (37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(ix))**

Appended herewith on the following pages 20-25 is a copy of a Declaration Under 37 CFR 1.132 that presents testimonial evidence in support of appellants position. The Declaration was submitted on May 2, 2008 in accompaniment with a Reply to the Office Action of January 8, 2008.

PAGE 1420 - RECEIVED AT 5/12/08 10:08:11 AM (RECEIVED DURING TRIM) - 8/12/08 10:08:11 AM (RECEIVED DURING TRIM) - 8/12/08 10:08:11 AM (RECEIVED DURING TRIM) - 8/12/08 10:08:11 AM (RECEIVED DURING TRIM)

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 02 2008

PATENT

BBUCP101USA

## CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being facsimiled to 571-233-4380 on the date shown below to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

Date: 5/12/08

Eric D. Jorgensen

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re patent application of:

Applicant(s): Brett J. Buchanan

Serial No: 10/752,898

Filing Date: January 6, 2004

Examiner: Steven N. Leff

Art Unit: 1761

Title: EDIBLE PET TOY

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

## DECLARATION UNDER 37 CFR 1.132

Brett J. Buchanan hereby declares that:

- 1) I am the inventor of EDIBLE PET TOY, as described in the above-identified U.S. patent application.
- 2) I am the owner of E.A.T.'s - Edible Animal Treats of Monroe, Michigan, a company doing business since June, 2003, that provides edible products for animals, particularly house cats.



Page 1620 - RECEIVED AT 5/2/2008 10:58:11 AM [E-mail: Douglas.Thrall@BBUCP101USA.COM] - CIP: 3/20 273 273 273 - DURATION: 00m-55s-04-30

10/752,898

BBUCP101USA

introduction to Pawbreakers. Each of them got his own Pawbreaker, and it was hilarious fun watching them chase their toy-treats around the floor, then nuzzle and love them before licking them to death.

It wasn't long before all the Pawbreakers had disappeared - either completely consumed or lost under our sectional furniture. Put a couple of the toy-treats in a dry bathtub and watch your cat's antics as the ball rolls up and down the sides, or try Pawbreakers with the Peek-a-Prize toy box (see sidebar for review). My four test cats give Pawbreakers four paws up, and I give them a "5" for combining snacktime with playtime for cats.

6) Another testimonial was received from Dr. Elizabeth Devitt, a freelance writer specializing in animal health-care topics for *PET AGE* magazine. In an email, Dr. Devitt stated, "I love the whole idea of your product." The following is an excerpt from an article in the March, 2008 issue of *PET AGE* magazine, entitled *Re-Inventing Catnip*.

But let's not forget the ever-popular catnip, which is surfacing in a variety of novel treat forms.

For example, Pawbreakers from Edible Animal Treats (Monroe, Mich.) are toys as well as consumable treats. Voted most innovative product by *Cat Fancy* in 2005, Pawbreakers combine domestically grown catnip with a hypoallergenic binder into a long-lasting toy that cats actually can consume.

Brett Buchanan, owner of Edible Animal Treats, says he created Pawbreakers because he was tired of seeing his cats turn away from toys after a short time. "After almost two years, my cat was still hating his Pawbreakers around," Buchanan said.

7) The following testimonial information about Pawbreakers was recently provided in answer to a series of questions by Pam Johnson-Bennett, CABC, of Cat Behavior Associates in Nashville, Tennessee. Pam Johnson-Bennett is one of America's most well-known and popular experts on cat behavior. In addition to running a private veterinarian-referral behavior service, Pam is the resident cat behavior expert at Yahoo.com. She also makes numerous national television appearances including Fox News Channel, CNN and National Geographic, as well as being a popular guest on many nationally syndicated radio programs. She is the author of seven titles, including *Cat vs. Cat*, *Think Like a Cat*, *Hiss & Tell*, and *Starting From Scratch*. Pam is the behavior spokesperson for Friskies. She is also



FIG. 10  
 FIG. 11  
 FIG. 12  
 FIG. 13  
 FIG. 14  
 FIG. 15  
 FIG. 16  
 FIG. 17  
 FIG. 18  
 FIG. 19  
 FIG. 20  
 FIG. 21  
 FIG. 22  
 FIG. 23  
 FIG. 24  
 FIG. 25  
 FIG. 26  
 FIG. 27  
 FIG. 28  
 FIG. 29  
 FIG. 30  
 FIG. 31  
 FIG. 32  
 FIG. 33  
 FIG. 34  
 FIG. 35  
 FIG. 36  
 FIG. 37  
 FIG. 38  
 FIG. 39  
 FIG. 40  
 FIG. 41  
 FIG. 42  
 FIG. 43  
 FIG. 44  
 FIG. 45  
 FIG. 46  
 FIG. 47  
 FIG. 48  
 FIG. 49  
 FIG. 50  
 FIG. 51  
 FIG. 52  
 FIG. 53  
 FIG. 54  
 FIG. 55  
 FIG. 56  
 FIG. 57  
 FIG. 58  
 FIG. 59  
 FIG. 60  
 FIG. 61  
 FIG. 62  
 FIG. 63  
 FIG. 64  
 FIG. 65  
 FIG. 66  
 FIG. 67  
 FIG. 68  
 FIG. 69  
 FIG. 70  
 FIG. 71  
 FIG. 72  
 FIG. 73  
 FIG. 74  
 FIG. 75  
 FIG. 76  
 FIG. 77  
 FIG. 78  
 FIG. 79  
 FIG. 80  
 FIG. 81  
 FIG. 82  
 FIG. 83  
 FIG. 84  
 FIG. 85  
 FIG. 86  
 FIG. 87  
 FIG. 88  
 FIG. 89  
 FIG. 90  
 FIG. 91  
 FIG. 92  
 FIG. 93  
 FIG. 94  
 FIG. 95  
 FIG. 96  
 FIG. 97  
 FIG. 98  
 FIG. 99  
 FIG. 100  
 FIG. 101  
 FIG. 102  
 FIG. 103  
 FIG. 104  
 FIG. 105  
 FIG. 106  
 FIG. 107  
 FIG. 108  
 FIG. 109  
 FIG. 110  
 FIG. 111  
 FIG. 112  
 FIG. 113  
 FIG. 114  
 FIG. 115  
 FIG. 116  
 FIG. 117  
 FIG. 118  
 FIG. 119  
 FIG. 120  
 FIG. 121  
 FIG. 122  
 FIG. 123  
 FIG. 124  
 FIG. 125  
 FIG. 126  
 FIG. 127  
 FIG. 128  
 FIG. 129  
 FIG. 130  
 FIG. 131  
 FIG. 132  
 FIG. 133  
 FIG. 134  
 FIG. 135  
 FIG. 136  
 FIG. 137  
 FIG. 138  
 FIG. 139  
 FIG. 140  
 FIG. 141  
 FIG. 142  
 FIG. 143  
 FIG. 144  
 FIG. 145  
 FIG. 146  
 FIG. 147  
 FIG. 148  
 FIG. 149  
 FIG. 150  
 FIG. 151  
 FIG. 152  
 FIG. 153  
 FIG. 154  
 FIG. 155  
 FIG. 156  
 FIG. 157  
 FIG. 158  
 FIG. 159  
 FIG. 160  
 FIG. 161  
 FIG. 162  
 FIG. 163  
 FIG. 164  
 FIG. 165  
 FIG. 166  
 FIG. 167  
 FIG. 168  
 FIG. 169  
 FIG. 170  
 FIG. 171  
 FIG. 172  
 FIG. 173  
 FIG. 174  
 FIG. 175  
 FIG. 176  
 FIG. 177  
 FIG. 178  
 FIG. 179  
 FIG. 180  
 FIG. 181  
 FIG. 182  
 FIG. 183  
 FIG. 184  
 FIG. 185  
 FIG. 186  
 FIG. 187  
 FIG. 188  
 FIG. 189  
 FIG. 190  
 FIG. 191  
 FIG. 192  
 FIG. 193  
 FIG. 194  
 FIG. 195  
 FIG. 196  
 FIG. 197  
 FIG. 198  
 FIG. 199  
 FIG. 200  
 FIG. 201  
 FIG. 202  
 FIG. 203  
 FIG. 204  
 FIG. 205  
 FIG. 206  
 FIG. 207  
 FIG. 208  
 FIG. 209  
 FIG. 210  
 FIG. 211  
 FIG. 212  
 FIG. 213  
 FIG. 214  
 FIG. 215  
 FIG. 216  
 FIG. 217  
 FIG. 218  
 FIG. 219  
 FIG. 220  
 FIG. 221  
 FIG. 222  
 FIG. 223  
 FIG. 224  
 FIG. 225  
 FIG. 226  
 FIG. 227  
 FIG. 228  
 FIG. 229  
 FIG. 230  
 FIG. 231  
 FIG. 232  
 FIG. 233  
 FIG. 234  
 FIG. 235  
 FIG. 236  
 FIG. 237  
 FIG. 238  
 FIG. 239  
 FIG. 240  
 FIG. 241  
 FIG. 242  
 FIG. 243  
 FIG. 244  
 FIG. 245  
 FIG. 246  
 FIG. 247  
 FIG. 248  
 FIG. 249  
 FIG. 250  
 FIG. 251  
 FIG. 252  
 FIG. 253  
 FIG. 254  
 FIG. 255  
 FIG. 256  
 FIG. 257  
 FIG. 258  
 FIG. 259  
 FIG. 260  
 FIG. 261  
 FIG. 262  
 FIG. 263  
 FIG. 264  
 FIG. 265  
 FIG. 266  
 FIG. 267  
 FIG. 268  
 FIG. 269  
 FIG. 270  
 FIG. 271  
 FIG. 272  
 FIG. 273  
 FIG. 274  
 FIG. 275  
 FIG. 276  
 FIG. 277  
 FIG. 278  
 FIG. 279  
 FIG. 280  
 FIG. 281  
 FIG. 282  
 FIG. 283  
 FIG. 284  
 FIG. 285  
 FIG. 286  
 FIG. 287  
 FIG. 288  
 FIG. 289  
 FIG. 290  
 FIG. 291  
 FIG. 292  
 FIG. 293  
 FIG. 294  
 FIG. 295  
 FIG. 296  
 FIG. 297  
 FIG. 298  
 FIG. 299  
 FIG. 300  
 FIG. 301  
 FIG. 302  
 FIG. 303  
 FIG. 304  
 FIG. 305  
 FIG. 306  
 FIG. 307  
 FIG. 308  
 FIG. 309  
 FIG. 310  
 FIG. 311  
 FIG. 312  
 FIG. 313  
 FIG. 314  
 FIG. 315  
 FIG. 316  
 FIG. 317  
 FIG. 318  
 FIG. 319  
 FIG. 320  
 FIG. 321  
 FIG. 322  
 FIG. 323  
 FIG. 324  
 FIG. 325  
 FIG. 326  
 FIG. 327  
 FIG. 328  
 FIG. 329  
 FIG. 330  
 FIG. 331  
 FIG. 332  
 FIG. 333  
 FIG. 334  
 FIG. 335  
 FIG. 336  
 FIG. 337  
 FIG. 338  
 FIG. 339  
 FIG. 340  
 FIG. 341  
 FIG. 342  
 FIG. 343  
 FIG. 344  
 FIG. 345  
 FIG. 346  
 FIG. 347  
 FIG. 348  
 FIG. 349  
 FIG. 350  
 FIG. 351  
 FIG. 352  
 FIG. 353  
 FIG. 354  
 FIG. 355  
 FIG. 356  
 FIG. 357  
 FIG. 358  
 FIG. 359  
 FIG. 360  
 FIG. 361  
 FIG. 362  
 FIG. 363  
 FIG. 364  
 FIG. 365  
 FIG. 366  
 FIG. 367  
 FIG. 368  
 FIG. 369  
 FIG. 370  
 FIG. 371  
 FIG. 372  
 FIG. 373  
 FIG. 374  
 FIG. 375  
 FIG. 376  
 FIG. 377  
 FIG. 378  
 FIG. 379  
 FIG. 380  
 FIG. 381  
 FIG. 382  
 FIG. 383  
 FIG. 384  
 FIG. 385  
 FIG. 386  
 FIG. 387  
 FIG. 388  
 FIG. 389  
 FIG. 390  
 FIG. 391  
 FIG. 392  
 FIG. 393  
 FIG. 394  
 FIG. 395  
 FIG. 396  
 FIG. 397  
 FIG. 398  
 FIG. 399  
 FIG. 400  
 FIG. 401  
 FIG. 402  
 FIG. 403  
 FIG. 404  
 FIG. 405  
 FIG. 406  
 FIG. 407  
 FIG. 408  
 FIG. 409  
 FIG. 410  
 FIG. 411  
 FIG. 412  
 FIG. 413  
 FIG. 414  
 FIG. 415  
 FIG. 416  
 FIG. 417  
 FIG. 418  
 FIG. 419  
 FIG. 420  
 FIG. 421  
 FIG. 422  
 FIG. 423  
 FIG. 424  
 FIG. 425  
 FIG. 426  
 FIG. 427  
 FIG. 428  
 FIG. 429  
 FIG. 430  
 FIG. 431  
 FIG. 432  
 FIG. 433  
 FIG. 434  
 FIG. 435  
 FIG. 436  
 FIG. 437  
 FIG. 438  
 FIG. 439  
 FIG. 440  
 FIG. 441  
 FIG. 442  
 FIG. 443  
 FIG. 444  
 FIG. 445  
 FIG. 446  
 FIG. 447  
 FIG. 448  
 FIG. 449  
 FIG. 450  
 FIG. 451  
 FIG. 452  
 FIG. 453  
 FIG. 454  
 FIG. 455  
 FIG. 456  
 FIG. 457  
 FIG. 458  
 FIG. 459  
 FIG. 460  
 FIG. 461  
 FIG. 462  
 FIG. 463  
 FIG. 464  
 FIG. 465  
 FIG. 466  
 FIG. 467  
 FIG. 468  
 FIG. 469  
 FIG. 470  
 FIG. 471  
 FIG. 472  
 FIG. 473  
 FIG. 474  
 FIG. 475  
 FIG. 476  
 FIG. 477  
 FIG. 478  
 FIG. 479  
 FIG. 480  
 FIG. 481  
 FIG. 482  
 FIG. 483  
 FIG. 484  
 FIG. 485  
 FIG. 486  
 FIG. 487  
 FIG. 488  
 FIG. 489  
 FIG. 490  
 FIG. 491  
 FIG. 492  
 FIG. 493  
 FIG. 494  
 FIG. 495  
 FIG. 496  
 FIG. 497  
 FIG. 498  
 FIG. 499  
 FIG. 500  
 FIG. 501  
 FIG. 502  
 FIG. 503  
 FIG. 504  
 FIG. 505  
 FIG. 506  
 FIG. 507  
 FIG. 508  
 FIG. 509  
 FIG. 510  
 FIG. 511  
 FIG. 512  
 FIG. 513  
 FIG. 514  
 FIG. 515  
 FIG. 516  
 FIG. 517  
 FIG. 518  
 FIG. 519  
 FIG. 520  
 FIG. 521  
 FIG. 522  
 FIG. 523  
 FIG. 524  
 FIG. 525  
 FIG. 526  
 FIG. 527  
 FIG. 528  
 FIG. 529  
 FIG. 530  
 FIG. 531  
 FIG. 532  
 FIG. 533  
 FIG. 534  
 FIG. 535  
 FIG. 536  
 FIG. 537  
 FIG. 538  
 FIG. 539  
 FIG. 540  
 FIG. 541  
 FIG. 542  
 FIG. 543  
 FIG. 544  
 FIG. 545  
 FIG. 546  
 FIG. 547  
 FIG. 548  
 FIG. 549  
 FIG. 550  
 FIG. 551  
 FIG. 552  
 FIG. 553  
 FIG. 554  
 FIG. 555  
 FIG. 556  
 FIG. 557  
 FIG. 558  
 FIG. 559  
 FIG. 560  
 FIG. 561  
 FIG. 562  
 FIG. 563  
 FIG. 564  
 FIG. 565  
 FIG. 566  
 FIG. 567  
 FIG. 568  
 FIG. 569  
 FIG. 570  
 FIG. 571  
 FIG. 572  
 FIG. 573  
 FIG. 574  
 FIG. 575  
 FIG. 576  
 FIG. 577  
 FIG. 578  
 FIG. 579  
 FIG. 580  
 FIG. 581  
 FIG. 582  
 FIG. 583  
 FIG. 584  
 FIG. 585  
 FIG. 586  
 FIG. 587  
 FIG. 588  
 FIG. 589  
 FIG. 590  
 FIG. 591  
 FIG. 592  
 FIG. 593  
 FIG. 594  
 FIG. 595  
 FIG. 596  
 FIG. 597  
 FIG. 598  
 FIG. 599  
 FIG. 600  
 FIG. 601  
 FIG. 602  
 FIG. 603  
 FIG. 604  
 FIG. 605  
 FIG. 606  
 FIG. 607  
 FIG. 608  
 FIG. 609  
 FIG. 610  
 FIG. 611  
 FIG. 612  
 FIG. 613  
 FIG. 614  
 FIG. 615  
 FIG. 616  
 FIG. 617  
 FIG. 618  
 FIG. 619  
 FIG. 620  
 FIG. 621  
 FIG. 622  
 FIG. 623  
 FIG. 624  
 FIG. 625  
 FIG. 626  
 FIG. 627  
 FIG. 628  
 FIG. 629  
 FIG. 630  
 FIG. 631  
 FIG. 632  
 FIG. 633  
 FIG. 634  
 FIG. 635  
 FIG. 636  
 FIG. 637  
 FIG. 638  
 FIG. 639  
 FIG. 640  
 FIG. 641  
 FIG. 642  
 FIG. 643  
 FIG. 644  
 FIG. 645  
 FIG. 646  
 FIG. 647  
 FIG. 648  
 FIG. 649  
 FIG. 650  
 FIG. 651  
 FIG. 652  
 FIG. 653  
 FIG. 654  
 FIG. 655  
 FIG. 656  
 FIG. 657  
 FIG. 658  
 FIG. 659  
 FIG. 660  
 FIG. 661  
 FIG. 662  
 FIG. 663  
 FIG. 664  
 FIG. 665  
 FIG. 666  
 FIG. 667  
 FIG. 668  
 FIG. 669  
 FIG. 670  
 FIG. 671  
 FIG. 672  
 FIG. 673  
 FIG. 674  
 FIG. 675  
 FIG. 676  
 FIG. 677  
 FIG. 678  
 FIG. 679  
 FIG. 680  
 FIG. 681  
 FIG. 682  
 FIG. 683  
 FIG. 684  
 FIG. 685  
 FIG. 686  
 FIG. 687  
 FIG. 688  
 FIG. 689  
 FIG. 690  
 FIG. 691  
 FIG. 692  
 FIG. 693  
 FIG. 694  
 FIG. 695  
 FIG. 696  
 FIG. 697  
 FIG. 698  
 FIG. 699  
 FIG. 700  
 FIG. 701  
 FIG. 702  
 FIG. 703  
 FIG. 704  
 FIG. 705  
 FIG. 706  
 FIG. 707  
 FIG. 708  
 FIG. 709  
 FIG. 710  
 FIG. 711  
 FIG. 712  
 FIG. 713  
 FIG. 714  
 FIG. 715  
 FIG. 716  
 FIG. 717  
 FIG. 718  
 FIG. 719  
 FIG. 720  
 FIG. 721  
 FIG. 722  
 FIG. 723  
 FIG. 724  
 FIG. 725  
 FIG. 726  
 FIG. 727  
 FIG. 728  
 FIG. 729  
 FIG. 730  
 FIG. 731  
 FIG. 732  
 FIG. 733  
 FIG. 734  
 FIG. 735  
 FIG. 736  
 FIG. 737  
 FIG. 738  
 FIG. 739  
 FIG. 740  
 FIG. 741  
 FIG. 742  
 FIG. 743  
 FIG. 744  
 FIG. 745  
 FIG. 746  
 FIG. 747  
 FIG. 748  
 FIG. 749  
 FIG. 750  
 FIG. 751  
 FIG. 752  
 FIG. 753  
 FIG. 754  
 FIG. 755  
 FIG. 756  
 FIG. 757  
 FIG. 758  
 FIG. 759  
 FIG. 760  
 FIG. 761  
 FIG. 762  
 FIG. 763  
 FIG. 764  
 FIG. 765  
 FIG. 766  
 FIG. 767  
 FIG. 768  
 FIG. 769  
 FIG. 770  
 FIG. 771  
 FIG. 772  
 FIG. 773  
 FIG. 774  
 FIG. 775  
 FIG. 776  
 FIG. 777  
 FIG. 778  
 FIG. 779  
 FIG. 780  
 FIG. 781  
 FIG. 782  
 FIG. 783  
 FIG. 784  
 FIG. 785  
 FIG. 786  
 FIG. 787  
 FIG. 788  
 FIG. 789  
 FIG. 790  
 FIG. 791  
 FIG. 792  
 FIG. 793  
 FIG. 794  
 FIG. 795  
 FIG. 796  
 FIG. 797  
 FIG. 798  
 FIG. 799  
 FIG. 800  
 FIG. 801  
 FIG. 802  
 FIG. 803  
 FIG. 804  
 FIG. 805  
 FIG. 806  
 FIG. 807  
 FIG. 808  
 FIG. 809  
 FIG. 810  
 FIG. 811  
 FIG. 812  
 FIG. 813  
 FIG. 814  
 FIG. 815  
 FIG. 816  
 FIG. 817  
 FIG. 818  
 FIG. 819  
 FIG. 820  
 FIG. 821  
 FIG. 822  
 FIG. 823  
 FIG. 824  
 FIG. 825  
 FIG. 826  
 FIG. 827  
 FIG. 828  
 FIG. 829  
 FIG. 830  
 FIG. 831  
 FIG. 832  
 FIG. 833  
 FIG. 834  
 FIG. 835  
 FIG. 836  
 FIG. 837  
 FIG. 838  
 FIG. 839  
 FIG. 840  
 FIG. 841  
 FIG. 842  
 FIG. 843  
 FIG. 844  
 FIG. 845  
 FIG. 846  
 FIG. 847  
 FIG. 848  
 FIG. 849  
 FIG. 850  
 FIG. 851  
 FIG. 852  
 FIG. 853  
 FIG. 854  
 FIG. 855  
 FIG. 856  
 FIG. 857  
 FIG. 858  
 FIG. 859  
 FIG. 860  
 FIG. 861  
 FIG. 862  
 FIG. 863  
 FIG. 864  
 FIG. 865  
 FIG. 866  
 FIG. 867  
 FIG. 868  
 FIG. 869  
 FIG. 870  
 FIG. 871  
 FIG. 872  
 FIG. 873  
 FIG. 874  
 FIG. 875  
 FIG. 876  
 FIG. 877  
 FIG. 878  
 FIG. 879  
 FIG. 880  
 FIG. 881  
 FIG. 882  
 FIG. 883  
 FIG. 884  
 FIG. 885  
 FIG. 886  
 FIG. 887  
 FIG. 888  
 FIG. 889  
 FIG. 890  
 FIG. 891  
 FIG. 892  
 FIG. 893  
 FIG. 894  
 FIG. 895  
 FIG. 896  
 FIG. 897  
 FIG. 898  
 FIG. 899  
 FIG. 900  
 FIG. 901  
 FIG. 902  
 FIG. 903  
 FIG. 904  
 FIG. 905  
 FIG. 906  
 FIG. 907  
 FIG. 908  
 FIG. 909  
 FIG. 910  
 FIG. 911  
 FIG. 912  
 FIG. 913  
 FIG. 914  
 FIG. 915  
 FIG. 916  
 FIG. 917  
 FIG. 918  
 FIG. 919  
 FIG. 920  
 FIG. 921  
 FIG. 922  
 FIG. 923  
 FIG. 924  
 FIG. 925  
 FIG. 926  
 FIG. 927  
 FIG. 928  
 FIG. 929  
 FIG. 930  
 FIG. 931  
 FIG. 932  
 FIG. 933  
 FIG. 934  
 FIG. 935  
 FIG. 936  
 FIG. 937  
 FIG. 938  
 FIG. 939  
 FIG. 940  
 FIG. 941  
 FIG. 942  
 FIG. 943  
 FIG. 944  
 FIG. 945  
 FIG. 946  
 FIG. 947  
 FIG. 948  
 FIG. 949  
 FIG. 950  
 FIG. 951  
 FIG. 952  
 FIG. 953  
 FIG. 954  
 FIG. 955  
 FIG. 956  
 FIG. 957  
 FIG. 958  
 FIG. 959  
 FIG. 960  
 FIG. 961  
 FIG. 962  
 FIG. 963  
 FIG. 964  
 FIG. 965  
 FIG. 966  
 FIG. 967  
 FIG. 968  
 FIG. 969  
 FIG. 970  
 FIG. 971  
 FIG. 972  
 FIG. 973  
 FIG. 974  
 FIG. 975  
 FIG. 976  
 FIG. 977  
 FIG. 978  
 FIG. 979  
 FIG. 980  
 FIG. 981  
 FIG. 982  
 FIG. 983  
 FIG. 984  
 FIG. 985  
 FIG. 986  
 FIG. 987  
 FIG. 988  
 FIG. 989  
 FIG. 990  
 FIG. 991  
 FIG. 992  
 FIG. 993  
 FIG. 994  
 FIG. 995  
 FIG. 996  
 FIG. 997  
 FIG. 998  
 FIG. 999  
 FIG. 1000

10/752,898

BBUCP101USA

squabbling, so I broke out the Pawbreakers and gave them each one. All was forgiven as both cats went nuts...will need some more as I plan on shipping a couple off to friends with their Christmas presents...and I sure don't want to run out here at home! - D. Sharples

My cats, Dari & Alex, have recently discovered the joys of Pawbreaker heaven.... Thank you SO MUCH for making this wonderfully entertaining product! These gentlemen, both 15 years old, have "never" expressed an interest in ANY particular toy, or in catnip at all, until I found Pawbreakers ....." - R. Wilken

#### Statistics:

The following statistics were compiled from hundreds of product testers in the USA and worldwide before introducing Pawbreakers to the public.

- 1) 9 out of 10 testers had positive reactions to the product
  - 2) 8 out of 10 cats reacted immediately
  - 3) 7 out of 10 cats played with this toy more than any other toy.
- ever!

3) *What is the availability of the product overall? What are the future plans for availability? -- The reason I ask this is that I don't include product information in my books if the product has very limited availability.*

We hope to have Pawbreakers available to customers around the world...currently we are in almost every state in the USA and growing rapidly (many locations have not been updated on our website, sorry...that should happen soon). Customers can order anytime on the web at [www.pawbreakers.com](http://www.pawbreakers.com). Shipping is included in the USA, Canada and Mexico...or, they can also find them at their local PETCO.

We also ship directly to customers around the world and we have retail locations in Canada, Japan, Taiwan, Malaysia, Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea, Poland and other locations around the world.

Please also note that Pawbreakers are also a 100% USA made product

Pam Johnson-Bennett replied with the following statement:

*I think the idea of your product is outstanding and if it performs as claimed on your website, it could be a valuable tool for behavior modification and I'd like more behaviorists and other professionals to know about it.*



PAGE 19/20 • RCVD AT 5/2/2008 10:08:11 AM (Eastern Daylight Time) • SVR:USPTO-ETXRF-01 • DMS:27/30300 • CSD:300 278 3135 • DURATION (mm-ss):04:26

BBUCP101USA

10/752,898

8) I believe that all statements made herein of my knowledge are true, and believe that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further, that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements and the like so made may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issuing therefrom.

**DECLARANT:**

Date: May 1, 2008

Brett Buchanan  
Brett J. Buchanan

- X.     **Related Proceedings Appendix (37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(x))**  
      (None)